Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 8

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part IV

From: **khalid zaheer**

To: **faithfreedom2 at gmail dot com**

Date: **Oct 22, 2006**

Dear Mr. Ali Sina

I am responding to your message dated October 10. I had the opportunity of talking to Mr Ghamidi directly this time to get his response on your last message. This is what we have to say on the points you have raised.

Our discussion is for the moment concentrating itself on the contents of the message of Islam in general and the Qur'an in particular. Your view is that the Qur'an is not God's book and therefore Islam is not His message. Our belief is just the opposite of it. We don't endorse many of the things which the contemporary Muslims are doing in the name of Islam. In fact, we both are concerned, for very different reasons though, that the present-day Muslim attitude should change. You seem to hold the opinion that the fanatic Muslim attitude can only change if they give up Islam; we believe that Muslims can only behave properly if they understand and follow the true Islam. However, for the purpose of making this discussion truly purposeful, we would suggest that we be very clear that we are trying to understand whether Qur'an is the word of God or not. For the sake of that purpose, we would request that we focus our attention on this single point and not allow any amount of external circumstances to distract us from it.

In your first message to us you raised these two points against our claim that the Qur'an was the word of God: i) The Qur'anic understanding regarding intercession contains contradictions and ii) the policy for usage of pronouns in the Qur'an for God seems to be inconsistent. We responded by presenting our understanding on both. In your second message you disagreed with the points we had mentioned to defend the Qur'anic presentation, to which we responded in our second response. In your third message (dated October 10) you have urged us to move on and leave it to the readers to conclude from what the two of us have mentioned in our respective messages on the two topics. We are now doing exactly that, assuming that you have

nothing more to say in response to what we have mentioned in defense of the Qur'anic teachings on intercession and its usage of pronouns for God.

Your third criticism on the Qur'anic presentation is that there doesn't seem to be any consistency in the manner the Qur'an presents the idea of who should guide whom. At times it seems that it is only men who can guide men; on other occasions we are given to understand that angels can come to guide men, and on still other occasions we get the impression that jinn can also get guided by men. The most prominent part of your comment appears when you present a passage from the Qur'an that mentions the fact that the Qur'an has informed us that at a certain stage an animal would also come to play a role in guiding men. There is thus, according to you, a complete absence of consistency in the manner the Qur'an presents its methodology of guidance.

Before responding to the point raised by you, we would want to emphasize that when one tries to understand the contents of a book as a sincere student who is not out there to pick faults in it but is involved in the serious business of understanding the text, it is important that one appreciates how the book itself presents its arguments and the premises on which those arguments are based. If we were not interested in sincerely understanding your messages and were bent upon picking faults in them, we could have pointed out several contradictions in what you have written to us as yet. However, that would have been a sheer waste of time and an exercise in futility. It is only after you have sincerely understood a text by appreciating the methodology of presentation which the author of the text himself is suggesting that you have a right to criticize the text or else it would come under the category of non-serious criticism. After you understand the scheme of presentation of a text, you have a right to criticize both that scheme as well as the text on the basis of your observation that the text is violating the principles stated by itself.

Now let us briefly mention the scheme presented by the Qur'an regarding the delivery of God's message. We have been informed in the Qur'an that the message of God Almighty comes to the messengers through angels. It is these messenger men who then deliver the message to their fellow humans for the purpose of ensuring that the addressees receive it in the most effective manner. When the message is communicated to humans through fellow men, they are in no position to present any excuse in their defense for denying them. The Qur'an is very clear in its claim that it is only men who can deliver the message of God to their fellow men for the latter to receive it in a manner that its claim to divine origins becomes unmistakable. The reference to the fact that jinn also hear the Qur'an and get guided by it is in the context that since some jinn could hear Qur'an and understand it, they too accepted its claim of divine origins. Had men been able to hear and see

jinn, they too would have been obliged to acknowledge the truthfulness of genuine messages of God delivered to that category of God's creation.

As for the mention of the animal, the Qur'an clarifies on several occasions the fact that after people refuse to accept God's message through the normal process of its presentation, He can use any of His signs to let such people know that their denial was not based on any evidence. For instance, on the day of judgment, it is mentioned that the limbs of human body would play the role of witnessing against the perpetrators of crimes. The reference to an animal in a Qur'anic passage is of similar nature. In our opinion, the following is the correct translation of the relevant passage: "You (O prophet) cannot force the dead to listen to your message nor can you force the deaf to hear the call even when they are turning their backs in disinterest. Likewise you can't guide the blind in their misguidance. You can only guide those who are willing to believe in our signs and in submitting themselves to the message. And once the message will be delivered in an undeniable form to them, we might bring out a beast from the land to confirm that these men were not willing to believe in our signs." (Qur'an; 27:80-82) The passage is mentioning that the appearance of a beast, if at all it happens, would only be meant to reinforce the earlier process of communication from the prophet as a final measure confirmation that the deniers were indeed guilty of rejecting a message that was so obvious that a beast could also confirm its divine origins. In other words, the evidence of the beast will not be meant to convince any of the humans to accept the message. Instead, it will be used as a final measure to expose the indefensible stubbornness of the deniers of the message of God.

We would be glad to know if the above presentation doesn't make sense to you. We would also like to know the reasons why you think this presentation is suggesting that the Qur'an is inconsistent in the manner it suggests its message should be communicated to men.

Khalid Zaheer